arXiv:1511.02819v1 [math.GN] 6 Nov 2015

ON $\mathcal{U}$-EQUIVALENCE SPACES

Farshad Omidi[a], MohammadReza Molaei[b]

[a]Department of Mathematics, Velayat University, Iranshahr, Iran

E-mail: faromidimath66@gmail.com

[b]Department of Pure Mathematics, Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman , Kerman, Iran

and Center of Excellence on Modeling and Control Systems

Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran

E-mail: mrmolaei@uk.ac.ir

Abstract

In this paper induced $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence spaces are introduced and discussed. Also the notion of $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently open subsets of a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space and $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently open functions are studied. Finally, equivalently uniformisable topological spaces are considered.

Keywords: $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence spaces; Uniformisable; $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently open set.
Mathematical Subject Classification: 54A05

1 Introduction

Non-Archimedean spaces have been considered from different viewpoints [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13, 14, 15]. In this paper we deal with $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence spaces. These spaces have been introduced first in 2014 [12]. A $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space $(X,\mathcal{U})$ is a set X along with a collection $\mathcal{U}$ of equivalence relations on X such that $\mathcal{U}$ is closed under finite intersections. A U-equivalence space is a structure close to uniform spaces [7, 8, 10] and fuzzy uniform spaces [6, 9].
A function $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ where $(X,\mathcal{U})$ and $(Y,\mathcal{V})$ are two $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence spaces is called $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous if $(f \times f)^{-1}(V) \in \mathcal{U}$ whenever $V \in \mathcal{V}$, where

$$(f \times f)^{-1}(V) = \{(x, y) \in X \times X | (f(x), f(y)) \in V\}.$$

Moreover if $(X,\mathcal{U})$ is a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space, then the collection $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}} = \{G \subseteq X |$ for each $x \in G$, there exists $U \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $U[x] \subseteq G\}$ is a topology on X with the base $\{U[x] | U \in \mathcal{U}, x \in X\}$ where $U[x] = \{y \in X | (x, y) \in U\}$. We refer to $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}}$ as the $\mathcal{U}$-induced topology. We are going to consider induced $\mathcal{U}$- equivalence classes and $\mathcal{U}$-products. Also we will introduce and discuss $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently open subspaces, and equivalently uniformisable spaces.

2 Induced $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence spaces and $\mathcal{U}$-products

Let $\{\Phi_i : X \longrightarrow X_i\}_{i\in I}$ be an indexed family of functions where X is a set and for each $i \in I$, $(X_i,\mathcal{U}_i)$ is a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space. The idea is to induce a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class [12] on X for which each Φ_i is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous without making the $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class on X unnecessarily strong.

Definition 2.1. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a family of equivalence relations on a set X. Then the collection of all finite intersections of members of $\mathcal{S}$ (that forms a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class on X) called the $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class generated by $\mathcal{S}$ and it is denoted by $\langle\mathcal{S}\rangle$.

Note that $\langle\mathcal{S}\rangle$ is the smallest $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class on X which contains $\mathcal{S}$.

Proposition 2.2. Let $\{\varphi_i : X \longrightarrow X_i | i \in I\}$ be an indexed family of functions where X is a set and for each $i \in I$, $(X_i,\mathcal{U}_i)$ is a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space. Then there exists a smallest $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class on X for which each Φ_i is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous.

Proof: Let $\mathcal{S}^{\leftarrow} = \{(\Phi_i \times \Phi_i)^{-1}(U_i)|U_i \in \mathcal{U}_i, i \in I\}$. Obviously, for each $U_i \in \mathcal{U}_i$, $i \in I$, $(\Phi_i \times \Phi_i)^{-1}(U_i)$ is an equivalence relation on X. Let $\mathcal{U}^{\leftarrow}$ be the $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class generated by $\mathcal{S}^{\leftarrow}$. Clearly for each $i \in I$, Φ_i is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous w.r.t. this $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class.

Finally, if $\mathcal{U}$ is a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class on X for which each Φ_i is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous and $U \in \mathcal{U}^{\leftarrow}$, then $U = \bigcap_{j=1}^{n}(\Phi_{i_j} \times \Phi_{i_j})^{-1}(U_{i_j}), U_{i_j} \in \mathcal{U}_{i_j}$. Since each Φ_i is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous w.r.t. $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{U}$ is closed under finite intersections, then $U \in \mathcal{U}$. Hence $\mathcal{U}^{\leftarrow} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$. ■

The $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class $\mathcal{U}^{\leftarrow}$ in the last proposition is called the induced $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class. Note that if each $\mathcal{U}_i$ has a base $\mathcal{B}_i$, then the collection $\{(\Phi_i \times \Phi_i)^{-1}(U_i)|U_i \in \mathcal{B}_i, i \in I\}$ generates $\mathcal{U}^{\leftarrow}$.

Corollary 2.3. Let $\Phi : X \longrightarrow Y$ be a function where X is a set and $(Y,\mathcal{V})$ is a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space.

Then $\mathcal{V}^{\leftarrow} = \{(\Phi \times \Phi)^{-1}(V)|V \in \mathcal{V}\}$.

The following property is a characteristic of the induced $\mathcal{U}$- equivalence classes.

Proposition 2.4. Let $\Phi : X \longrightarrow Y$ and $\Psi : Y \longrightarrow Z$ be functions where $(X,\mathcal{U})$, (Y,Z) and $(Z,\mathcal{W})$ are $\mathcal{U}$- equivalence spaces. If Y has the induced $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class, then Φ is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous if and only if $\Psi\Phi$ is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous.

Proof: The proposition follows from the equality

$$(\Psi o\Phi \times \Psi o\Phi)^{-1}(W) = (\Phi \times \Phi)^{-1}((\Psi \times \Psi)^{-1}(W))$$

where W runs through the members of $\mathcal{W}$ and the fact that $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{W}^{\leftarrow}$. ■

Let $(X,\mathcal{U})$ be a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space and let $A \subseteq X$. By Corollary 2.3. (let Φ to be inclusion map) the collection $\{A \times A \cap U|U \in \mathcal{U}\}$ is the induced $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class on A that is called relative $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class and denoted by $\mathcal{U}/A$ (see [12]).

Hence $\mathcal{U}/A$ is the smallest $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class on A makes inclusion map $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous.

Definition 2.5. (a) Let $(X,\mathcal{U})$ and $(Y,\mathcal{V})$ be two $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence spaces. A bijection $\Phi : X \longrightarrow Y$ is said to be a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence (function) if Φ and Φ^{-1} are $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently

continuous. (b) A function $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ is said to be $\mathcal{U}$-embedding if it is one to one and a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence when regarded as a function from $(X,\mathcal{U})$ on to $(f(X), \mathcal{V}/f(X))$.

Theorem 2.6. Let $(X,\mathcal{U})$ and $(Y,\mathcal{V})$ be two $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence spaces and let $\Phi : X \longrightarrow Y$ be a function. Then the following statements are equivalent: (a) Φ is a $\mathcal{U}$-embedding. (b) Φ is one to one, $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous and $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{V}^{\leftarrow}$

Proof: (a)⇒(b). Since Φ is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous when regarded as a function from $(X,\mathcal{U})$, then $\mathcal{V}^{\leftarrow} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$. Conversely, if $U \in \mathcal{U}$, then $(\Phi^{-1} \times \Phi^{-1})^{-1}(U) \in \mathcal{V}/\Phi(X)$. Hence $(\Phi^{-1} \times \Phi^{-1})^{-1}(U) = (\Phi(X) \times \Phi(X)) \cap V$ for some $V \in \mathcal{V}$. So $U = (\Phi \times \Phi)^{-1}(V)$. Hence $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{V}^{\leftarrow}$.

(b)⇒(a). Since $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{V}^{\leftarrow}$, then Φ is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous. To complete the proof, we will prove that $\Phi^{-1} : (\Phi(X), \mathcal{V}/\Phi(X)) \longrightarrow (X,\mathcal{U})$ is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous. For this, let $U \in \mathcal{U}$, $V \in \mathcal{V}$ and $U = (\Phi \times \Phi)^{-1}(V)$.

So $(\Phi^{-1} \times \Phi^{-1})^{-1}(U) = (\Phi(X) \times \Phi(X)) \cap V$. Hence Φ^{-1} is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous. ■

Not all $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous injections are $\mathcal{U}$-embedding's. For example let X be a set and $\mathcal{U}$ be the collection of all equivalence relations on X and $\mathcal{V}$ consists of X^2 and let Φ be the identity map on X. Then Φ is a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently injection when regarded as a function from $(X,\mathcal{U})$ on to $(X,\mathcal{V})$ but not $\mathcal{U}$-embedding if $|X| > 1$. A useful sufficient condition is

Proposition 2.7. Let $\Phi : X \longrightarrow Y$ be a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous function where $(X,\mathcal{U})$ and $(Y,\mathcal{V})$ are $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence spaces. Suppose Φ admits a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently left inverse. Then Φ is a $\mathcal{U}$-embedding.

Proof: Suppose $\Psi : Y \longrightarrow X$ is the $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently left inverse of Φ. By theorem 2.6 it is sufficient to show $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{V}^{\leftarrow}$. Suppose $U \in \mathcal{U}$ and $V = (\Psi \times \Psi)^{-1}(U)$. Since Ψ is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous, then $V \in \mathcal{V}$ and $(\Phi \times \Phi)^{-1}(V) = (\Phi \times \Phi)^{-1}((\Psi \times \Psi)^{-1}(U)) = (\Psi o \Phi \times \Psi o \Phi)^{-1}(U) = U$. The last equality is true because $\Psi o \Phi$ is the identity map on X. Hence $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{V}^{\leftarrow}$.■

Proposition 2.8. Let $\{X_j\}$ be a finite covering of the $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space $(X,\mathcal{U})$. Suppose that X_j is totally bounded [12] for each index j. Then X is totally bounded.

Proof: We recall that X is totally bounded if for each $U \in \mathcal{U}$ there exists $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n \in X$ such that $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} U[x_i]$. Let $X = \bigcup_{j=1}^{m} X_j$ and let $U \in \mathcal{U}$ and $U_j = X_j \times X_j \cap U$ for each j.

Since X_j is totally bounded, then there exists $x_1^j, x_2^j, \ldots, x_{n_j}^j \in X_j$ such that $X_j = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n_j} U_j[x_i^j]$. Hence $X = \bigcup_{j=1}^{m} \bigcup_{i=1}^{n_j} U[x_i^j]$.■

The converse of Proposition 2.8 is true. In fact we have

Proposition 2.9. Let $\Phi : X \longrightarrow Y$ be a function where X is a set and $(Y,\mathcal{V})$ is a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space. If Y is totally bounded, then so is X with the induced $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class.

Proof: Let $V \in \mathcal{V}$ and let $U = (\Phi \times \Phi)^{-1}(V)$. There exist $y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n \in Y$ such

that $Y = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} V[y_i]$. If $T = \{y_i | \Phi^{-1}(V[y_i]) \neq \Phi\}$, then $T \neq \Phi$. For each $y_i \in T$, choose a member of the non-empty set $\Phi^{-1}(V[y_i])$, say, x_i. Suppose $x \in X$ and let $y = \Phi(x)$. Then $y \in V[y_i]$ for some i. Hence $(y_i, y) \in V$. Thus $(\Phi(x_i), y) \in V$ because V is an equivalence relation on X. Consequently $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} U[x_i]$.■

The notation of induced $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence classes is the standard way of giving a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class to the cartesian product $X = \Pi X_i$ where $\{(X_i, \mathcal{U}_i) | i \in I\}$ is an indexed family of $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence spaces.

More precisely, let $\{(X_i, \mathcal{U}_i) | i \in\}$ be given. For each $i \in I$ let π_i be the i-th canonical projection. By Proposition 2.2, there exists a smallest $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class $\Pi\mathcal{U}_i$ for which π_i is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous. The $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space $(\Pi X_i, \Pi\mathcal{U}_i)$ is called the $\mathcal{U}$-product of family $\{(X_i, \mathcal{U}_i) | i \in I\}$.

Proposition 2.10. Let $\{(X_i, \mathcal{U}_i) | i \in I\}$ be a family of $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence spaces and let $\Phi : A \longrightarrow \Pi X_i$ be a function where A is a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space and $(\Pi X_i, \Pi\mathcal{U}_i)$ is the $\mathcal{U}$-product. Then Φ is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous if and only if each of the functions $\Phi_j = \pi_j o \Phi : A \longrightarrow X_j$ is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous.

Proof: The proof is an easy consequence of the equality $(\pi_j o\Phi \times \pi_j o\Phi)^{-1}(U_j) = (\Phi \times \Phi)^{-1}((\pi_j \times \pi_j)^{-1}(U_j))$ for $U_j \in \mathcal{U}_j$, $j \in I$.■

According to [12] a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space $(X, \mathcal{U})$ is separated if the intersection of all members of $\mathcal{U}$ coincides with $\Delta X = \{(x, x) | x \in X\}$.

Proposition 2.11. Let $\{(X_i, \mathcal{U}_i) | i \in I\}$ be a family of separated $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence spaces. Then the $\mathcal{U}$-product is separated .

Proof: Let $x = (x_i)$ and $y = (y_i)$ be two members of $X = \Pi X_i$ and $(x, y) \in U$ for all $U \in \Pi\mathcal{U}_i$.

So $(x, y) \in (\pi_i \times \pi_i)^{-1}(U_i)$ for each $U_i \in \mathcal{U}_i$, $i \in I$. Hence $x = y$. Consequently the intersection of all members of $\Pi\mathcal{U}_i$ coincides with ΔX. Hence $(\Pi X_i, \Pi\mathcal{U}_i)$ is separated.■

Theorem 2.12. Let $\{(X_i, \mathcal{U}_i) | i \in I\}$ be a family of separated $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence spaces. Then $\mathcal{T}_{\Pi\mathcal{U}_i} = \Pi\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}_i}$.

Proof: Let $j \in I$ be fixed and let $X = \Pi X_i$, We contend $\pi_j : X \longrightarrow X_j$ is continuous when regarded as a function from topological space $(X, \mathcal{T}_{\Pi\mathcal{U}_i})$ onto topological space $(X_j, \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}_j})$. To see this, let $G_j \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}_j}$ and $G = \pi_j^{-1}(G_j)$. Suppose $x = (x_i) \in G$. Thus $x_j \in G_j$. So, there exists $U_j \in \mathcal{U}_j$ such that $U_j[x_j] \subseteq G_j$.

If $U = (\pi_j \times \pi_j)^{-1}(U_j)$, then $U \in \Pi\mathcal{U}_i$. Suppose $z = (z_i) \in U[x]$. Thus $z_j \in U_j[x_j] \subseteq G_j$. So $z \in G$. Thus $U[x] \subseteq G$. This proves π_j is continuous. Hence by definition of $\Pi\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}_i}$, $\Pi\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}_i} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{\Pi\mathcal{U}_i}$. For other way inclusion, suppose $G \in \mathcal{T}_{\Pi\mathcal{U}_i}$ and $x \in G$. Then there exists $U_{i_j} \in \mathcal{U}_{i_j}$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$ such that $\bigcap_{j=1}^{n} (\pi_{i_j} \times \pi_{i_j})^{-1}(U_{i_j}) \subseteq U$ and $U[x] \subseteq G$ for some $U \in \Pi\mathcal{U}_i$.

Assume $G_{i_j} = U_{i_j}[x_{i_j}]$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$. Then $G_{i_j} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}_{i_j}}$ and $x \in \bigcap_{j=1}^{n} \pi_{i_j}^{-1}(G_{i_j}) \subseteq G$.

Hence $\mathcal{T}_{\Pi\mathcal{U}_i} \subseteq \Pi\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}_i}$. Consequently, $\mathcal{T}_{\Pi\mathcal{U}_i} = \Pi\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}_i}$.

3 $\mathcal{U}$-Equivalently Open Subspaces

Among the subspaces of a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space $(X,\mathcal{U})$ special attention should be given to those which are $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently open, in the sense that the inclusion map is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently open. We recall that a function $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ where $(X,\mathcal{U})$ and $(Y,\mathcal{V})$ are $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence spaces is called $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently open if for each $U \in \mathcal{U}$, there exists $V \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $V[f(x)] \subseteq f(U[x])$ for all $x \in X$. Roughly speaking, every $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently open function is locally surjective (see [12]). For example Φ is always $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently open when $\mathcal{V}$ is discrete i.e. $\mathcal{V}$ is the collection of all equivalence relations on Y.

Let $(X,\mathcal{U})$ be a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space. Then $\mathcal{U}$ is called rich if $X^2 \in \mathcal{U}$.

Proposition 3.1. Let $(X,\mathcal{U})$ be a rich $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space and let $A \subseteq X$. Then the following statements are equivalent:

(a) A is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently open.

(b) for each $U \in \mathcal{U}$, there exists $V \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $V[x] \subseteq U[x] \cap A$ for all points $x \in A$.

(c) there exists $V_0 \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $V_0[x] \subseteq A$ for all points $x \in A$ (in particular $A \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}}$).

Proof: (a)→(b). Let $U \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\tilde{U} = A \times A \cap U$.

Then $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{U}/A$. So there exists $V \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $V[x] \subseteq \tilde{U}[x]$ for all points $x \in A$.

Hence $V[x] \subseteq U[x] \cap A$ for all $x \in A$.

(b)→(c). Since $X^2 \in \mathcal{U}$, then there exists $V_0 \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $V_0[x] \subseteq X^2[x] \cap A$ for all $x \in A$. Hence $V_0[x] \subseteq A$ for all points $x \in A$.

(c)→(a). Let $\tilde{U} = A \times A \cap U \in \mathcal{U}|A$ and let $V = V_0 \cap U$. Then $V \in \mathcal{U}$ and $V[i(x)] \subseteq i(\tilde{U}[x])$ for all points $x \in A$. Hence A is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently open.■

Suppose $\alpha, \beta : X \longrightarrow Y$ are maps from X into Y. The coincidence set of α and β is the set $C(\alpha,\beta) = \{x \in X | \alpha(x) = \beta(x)\}$. Also if $\varphi : X \longrightarrow Y$ is a function from the $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space $(X,\mathcal{U})$ into the set Y, let us say that φ is transverse to X (or $(X,\mathcal{U})$) if $(\varphi \times \varphi)^{-1}(\Delta Y) \cap U = \Delta X$ for some $U \in \mathcal{U}$. Roughly speaking, φ is transverse to X if φ is one to one on a region of X^2.

Proposition 3.2. Let $(X,\mathcal{U})$, $(Y,\mathcal{V})$ and $(Z,\mathcal{W})$ be $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence spaces, $\alpha, \beta : X \longrightarrow Y$ be two $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous functions and $\varphi : Y \longrightarrow Z$ be transverse to Y. If $\varphi o\alpha = \varphi o\beta$ and $\mathcal{U}$ is rich then the coincidence set $C(\alpha,\beta)$ is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently open in X.

Proof: To prove the proposition, we use part (c) of proposition (3.1). By the transitivity of φ, there exists $V \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $(\varphi \times \varphi)^{-1}(\Delta Z) \cap V = \Delta Y$.

It is easy to see that $U_0[x] \subseteq C(\alpha,\beta)$ for all $x \in C(\alpha,\beta)$ where

$$U_0 = (\alpha \times \alpha)^{-1}(V) \cap (\beta \times \beta)^{-1}(V). \blacksquare$$

Definition 3.3. Let $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ be a function where X is a set and $(Y,\mathcal{V})$ is a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space. f is called $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently surjection if for each $y \in Y$ and $V \in \mathcal{V}$, there exists $x \in X$ such that $y \in V[f(x)]$.

Obviously any surjection from X onto the $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space $(Y,\mathcal{V})$ is a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently surjection.

On the other hand if $X = Y = \mathbf{R}$ (the set of real numbers) and $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathbf{R^2}\}$, we define $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ by $f(x) = x^2$, then f is a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently surjection but not a surjection.

Proposition 3.4. Let $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ be a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently surjection. If f is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently open and $\mathcal{U}$ is rich, then f is a surjection.

Proof: Since f is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently open, then there exists $V \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $V[f(x)] \subseteq f(X)$ for all $x \in X$ because $\mathcal{U}$ is rich. If $y \in Y$, then there exists $x \in X$ such that $y \in V[f(x)]$. Hence $y \in f(X)$ that means f is a surjection.■

Definition 3.5. Let $(X,\mathcal{U})$ be a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space. A subset D of X is said to be $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently dense (in X), if for each $x \in X$ and each $U \in \mathcal{U}$, there exists $a \in D$ such that $(a, x) \in U$.

Note that D is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently dense iff D is a dense subset of topological space $(X, \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}})$. Also, note that D is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently dense in X iff the inclusion map $i : D \to X$ is a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently surjection.

Proposition 3.6. Let $(X,\mathcal{U})$ be a rich $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space and let A be a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently open and $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently dense subset of X. then A equals X.

Proof: Since A is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently open, then the inclusion map $i : A \longrightarrow X$ is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently open. If $x \in X$ and $U \in \mathcal{U}$, then there exists $a \in A$ such that $(a, x) \in U$. So $x \in U[i(a)]$. Hence the inclusion map is also a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently surjection. Now Proposition 3.4 implies the inclusion map is a surjection. Hence A equals X.■

Corollary 3.7. Let $(X,\mathcal{U})$, $(Y,\mathcal{V})$ and $(Z,\mathcal{W})$ be $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence spaces and let $\alpha, \beta : X \longrightarrow Y$ be $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous and $\varphi : Y \longrightarrow Z$ be transverse to Y. If $\varphi o\alpha = \varphi o\beta$, $\mathcal{U}$ is rich and if the coincidence set $C(\alpha, \beta)$ is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently dense, then $\alpha = \beta$.

We say the $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space $(X,\mathcal{U})$ is connected if the topological space $(X, \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}})$ is connected. We have the following strange result:

Proposition 3.8. Every non-empty subset of a connected $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently dense.

Proof: Let A be a non-empty subset of a connected $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space $(X,\mathcal{U})$ and let $U \in \mathcal{U}$. Since A is non-empty, then so is $U[A]$. We contend that $U[A]$ is clopen. To see this, since $U[A] = \bigcup_{x \in A} U[x]$, then $U[A]$ is open. On the other hand, $\overline{U[A]} = \bigcup_{v \in \mathcal{U}} V[U[A]]$, where $\overline{U[A]}$ is the closure of $U[A]$ w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}}$. Hence

$$\overline{U[A]} \subseteq U[U[A]] \subseteq U[A].$$

The last statement is true because U is an equivalence relation on X. So $U[A]$ is closed. Hence the conectedness of the $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space $(X,\mathcal{U})$ implies that $U[A] = X$. Now if $x \in X$, then $x \in U[A]$. Thus $(a, x) \in U$ for some $a \in A$ that means A is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently dense in X.■

Corollary 3.9. Every $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently open subset of a connected $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence

space is either empty or full.

Proof: immediate from (3.6) and (3.8).■

Corollary 3.10. Let $(X,\mathcal{U})$, $(Y,\mathcal{V})$ and $(Z,\mathcal{W})$ be $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence spaces and let $\alpha,\beta : X \longrightarrow Y$ be $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous and $\varphi : Y \longrightarrow Z$ be transverse to Y. If $\varphi o\alpha = \varphi o\beta$, $\mathcal{U}$ is rich and $\alpha(x_0) = \beta(x_0)$ for some point x_0 in X and if $(X,\mathcal{U})$ is connected, then $\alpha = \beta$.

Proof: The coincidence set $C(\alpha,\beta)$ is non-empty because $\alpha(x_0) = \beta(x_0)$. Now the result follows from Corollary 3.7 and 3.9.■

4 Equivalently uniformisable spaces

In this section we consider topological spaces which are equivalently uniformisable. More precisely, let $(X,\mathcal{T})$ be a topological space. The question is: under what condition(s) there exists a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class $\mathcal{U}$ on X such that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}} = \mathcal{T}$. We begin with the following definition.

Definition 4.1. A topological space $(X,\mathcal{T})$ is said to be equivalently uniformisable if there exists a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class on X such that $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}}$.

Proposition 4.2. Let $(X,\mathcal{T})$ and $(Y,\mathcal{V})$ be respectively topological and $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence spaces and let $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ be a topological equivalence from topological space $(X,\mathcal{T})$ on to topological space $(Y,\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{V}})$. Then the topological space $(X,\mathcal{T})$ is equivalently uniformisable.

Proof: Let $\mathcal{U}$ be the induced $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class on X by $\mathcal{V}$ (i.e. $\mathcal{U} = \overleftarrow{\mathcal{V}} = \{(f\times f)^{-1}(V)|V\in\mathcal{V}\}$. We contend that $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}}$. Suppose $G\in\mathcal{T}$ and $x\in G$. Since f is a topological equivalence, then $f(G)\in\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{V}}$. Hence there exists $V\in\mathcal{V}$ such that $V[f(x)]\subseteq f(G)$. Let $U = (f\times f)^{-1}(V)$. Then $U\in\mathcal{U}$ and $U[x]\subseteq G$. Hence $\mathcal{T}\subseteq\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}}$. Conversely let $G\in\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}}$ and $x\in G$. Since $x\in G$ and $G\in\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}}$, then there exists $U\in\mathcal{U}$ and $V\in\mathcal{V}$ with $U = (f\times f)^{-1}(V)$ and $U[x]\subseteq G$. Let $O = V[f(x)]$ and $G' = f^{-1}(O)$. Then $G'\in\mathcal{T}$ and $x\in G'\subseteq G$. This shows that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}}\subseteq\mathcal{T}$. Consequently $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}}$. This means that topological space $(X,\mathcal{T})$ is equivalently uniformisable.■

Proposition 4.3. Let $(X,\mathcal{U})$ be a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence space and let $Y\subseteq X$. Then $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}/Y} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}}/Y$.

Proof: We recall that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}}/Y = \{Y\cap G|G\in\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}}\}$ and

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}/Y} = \{G\subseteq Y|\forall y\in G, \exists V_y\in\mathcal{U}/Y, V_y[y]\subseteq G\}$$

and $\mathcal{U}/Y = \{Y\times Y\cap U|U\in\mathcal{U}\}$. We now turn to the proof. We first show that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}/Y}\subseteq\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}}/Y$. Let $G\in\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}/Y}$ and let $y\in G$. Then there exists $V_y\in\mathcal{U}/Y$ and $U_y\in\mathcal{U}$ such that $V_y = Y\times Y\cap U_y$ and $V_y[y]\subseteq G$. Let $G_1 = \bigcup_{y\in G} U_y[y]$. Then $G_1\in\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}}$ and $G = Y\cap G_1$. So $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}/Y}\subseteq\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}}/Y$. Now let $G\in\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}}/Y$ and let $y\in G$. Then $G = Y\cap G_1$ for some $G_1\in\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}}$. Since $G_1\in\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}}$, then there exists $U_y\in\mathcal{U}$ such that $U_y[y]\subseteq G_1$. If $V_y = Y\times Y\cap U_y$, then $V_y[y]\subseteq G$. This shows that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}}/Y\subseteq\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}/Y}$. Hence these two topologies are the same.■

Proposition 4.4. Let $(X, \mathcal{T})$ and $(Y, \mathcal{V})$ be respectively topological and $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence spaces and let $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ be a topological embedding from $(X, \mathcal{T})$ into topological space $(Y, \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{V}})$. Then $(X, \mathcal{T})$ is equivalently uniformisable.

Proof. The function $f : X \longrightarrow Z$ is a topological equivalence where $Z = f(X)$ regarded as a topological space with $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{V}}/Z$ (the induced topology on Z by $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{V}}$). But by Proposition 4.3, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{V}}/Z = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{V}/Z}$. Hence by Proposition 4.2, $(X, \mathcal{T})$ is equivalently uniformisable.■

By Proposition 4.4, a topological space is equivalently uniformisable if it can be embedded into a topological space whose topology induced by a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class.

Definition 4.5. Let (X, d) be a pseudo metric space and let r be a positive real number. Then

(a) d is called r-transitive if $d(x, y) < r$, $d(y, z) < r$ implies $d(x, z) < r$ for all points x, y and z in X.

(b) d is called transitive if for each $r > 0$, d is r-transitive.

For an example of r-transitive pseudo-metric, let X be a non-empty set and let

$$d_\alpha(x, y) = \begin{cases} \alpha & x \neq y \\ 0 & x = y \end{cases}$$

where α is a positive real number. Then for each $r > \alpha$, d_α is r-transitive.

Let d be a transitive pseudo-metric on a set X and let

$$B_d(r) = \{(x, y) \in X \times X | d(x, y) < r\}.$$

Then the collection $\{B_d(r) : r > 0\}$ forms a $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class on X that is called the $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class generated by d and denoted by $\mathcal{U}_d$.

Theorem 4.6. If a topological space can be embedded into a product of transitive pseudo-metric spaces, then it is equivalently uniformisable.

Proof: Suppose $\{(X_i, d_i) : i \in I\}$ is an indexed collection of transitive pseudo metric spaces and let $f : (X, \mathcal{T}) \longrightarrow (\Pi X_i, \Pi \mathcal{T}_{d_i})$ be a topological embedding. For each i, let $\mathcal{U}_i = \mathcal{U}_{d_i}$ and $\mathcal{U} = \Pi \mathcal{U}_i$. Hence $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}} = \mathcal{T}_{\Pi \mathcal{U}_i} = \Pi \mathcal{T}_{d_i}$ and so $f : (X, \mathcal{T}) \longrightarrow (\Pi X_i, \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}})$ is a topological embedding. Now the result follows from proposition 4.4.■

Definition 4.7. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a family of transitive pseudo metrics on set X and let $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D}}$ be the collection $\{B_d(r) : r > 0, d \in \mathcal{D}\}$. The $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class generated by $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D}}$ is called the $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class generated by $\mathcal{D}$ and denoted by $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}}$. Note that since for each $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and each $r > 0$, d is r-transitive, then $B_d(r)$ is an equivalence relation on X.

Proposition 4.8. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a collection of transitive pseudo metrics on a set X. Then $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}}}$ where $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}}$ is the topology generated by sub-base

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D}}} = \{B_d(x, r) : x \in X, r > 0, d \in \mathcal{D}\}.$$

Proof: Let $G \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}}}$ and let $x \in G$. Then $U[x] \subseteq G$ for some $U \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}}$. By the definition of $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}}$, $U = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} B_{d_i}(r_i)$ where $r_i > 0$ and $d_i \in \mathcal{D}$. For each i, let $x_i = x$. Then

$x \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} B_{d_i}(x_i, r_i) \subseteq G$. Hence $G \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}}$. Conversely, let $x \in G \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}}$. Then $x \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} B_{d_i}(x_i, r_i) \subseteq G$ where $x_i \in X$, $r_i > 0$, $d_i \in \mathcal{D}$. If $U = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} B_{d_i}(r_i)$, then $U \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}}$. we contend $U[x] \subseteq G$. For let $y \in U[x]$, then $d_i(x, y) < r_i$ for all i.

On the other hand, $d_i(x, x_i) < r_i$ for all i, because $x \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} B_{d_i}(x_i, r_i)$. By the transitivity of d_i, we have $d_i(x_i, y) < r_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Thus $y \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} B_{d_i}(x_i, r_i) \subseteq G$. Consequently $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}}}$.■

Proposition 4.9. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a collection of transitive pseudo metrics on a set X. For each $d \in \mathcal{D}$, let X_d be a copy of the set X and let $Y = \Pi_{d \in \mathcal{D}} X_d$. Then the evaluation function $f : (X, \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}}) \longrightarrow (Y, \Pi\mathcal{U}_d)$ defined by $f(x)(d) = x$ for all $d \in \mathcal{D}$, is a $\mathcal{U}$-embedding of $(X, \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}})$ into $(Y, \Pi\mathcal{U}_d)$.

Proof: Obviously f is an injection. Let $U = (\pi_d \times \pi_d)^{-1}(U_d)$, $U_d = B_d(r)$ for some positive real r. Then $(f \times f)^{-1}(U) = U_d \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}}$. Hence f is $\mathcal{U}$-equivalently continuous. Finally, let Z be the range of the function f and let $r > 0$ and $d \in \mathcal{D}$ be given . Since $(f \times f)(B_d(r)) = Z \times Z \cap (\pi_d \times \pi_d)^{-1}(B_d(r))$, then $(f \times f)(B_d(r)) \in \Pi\mathcal{U}_d/Z$. Now let $U = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} B_{d_i}(r_i) \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}}$. Then $(f \times f)(U) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} (f \times f)(B_{d_i}(r_i))$ because f is a bijection. Hence $(f \times f)(U) \in \Pi\mathcal{U}_d/Z$. Consequently, f is a $\mathcal{U}$-embedding.■

Theorem 4.10. An equivalently uniformisable topological space which its associated $\mathcal{U}$-equivalence class generated by a collection of transitive pseudo metrics, can be topologically embedded into a product of transitive pseudo-metric spaces.

Proof: Let $(X, \mathcal{T})$ be the topological space induced by $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}}$ where $\mathcal{D}$ is a collection of transitive pseudo metrics on X. By Proposition 4.9, there exists a $\mathcal{U}$-embedding $f : (X, \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}}) \longrightarrow (\Pi X_d, \Pi\mathcal{U}_d)$. Hence $f : (X, \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}}}) \longrightarrow (\Pi X_d, \mathcal{T}_{\pi\mathcal{U}_d})$ is a topological embedding. But $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}}}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\Pi\mathcal{U}_d} = \Pi\mathcal{T}_d$. Thus $f : (X, \mathcal{T}) \longrightarrow (\Pi X_d, \Pi\mathcal{T}_d)$ is a topological embedding.■

References

[1] Banaschewski B.: $\ddot{U}$ber nulldimensionale r$\ddot{a}$ume. Math. Nachr. 13 129140 (1955).

[2] Bruno L.: Description combinatoire des ultramétriques. Centre de Mathématique Sociale. cole Pratique des Hautes Études. Mathématiques et Sciences Humaines, 73, 537 (1981).

[3] Deses D.: On the representation of non-Archimedean objects. Topology and its Applications2005; 153, 5, 774-785 (2005).

[4] D. Dikranjan, E. Giuli, A. Tozzi: Topological categories and closure operators. Quaestiones Mathematicae, 11, 3, 323-337 (1988).

[5] Gutkin O.: Clustering of periodic orbits in chaotic systems, Nonlinearity, 26, 177200 (2013).

[6] Hutton B.: Uniformities of fuzzy topological spaces. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 58, 559-571 (1977).

[7] James, I.M.: Topological and uniform spaces. Springer, New York (1987).

[8] Kunzi, H.P.A.: Uniform structures in the beginning of the third millenium. Topol. Appl., 154, 14, 2745-2756 (2007).

[9] Lowen, R.: Fuzzy uniform spaces. Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, 82 2, 370385 (1981).

[10] Melikhov, S.A.: Metrizable uniform spaces. http://arxiv.org/pdf/1106.3249v4.pdf, 1-77 (2012).

[11] Monna A.F.: Remarques sur les métriques non-Archimédiennes. I, II, Indag. Math. 53 122133, 179191 (1950).

[12] Omidi, F., Molaei, M.R.: U-Equivalence spaces. J. Appl. Environ. Biol. Sci., 4 2, 299-305 (2014).

[13] Preuß G.: E-zusammenhängende Räume, Manuscripta Mathematica, 3, 4, 331-342 (1970).

[14] Van Rooij A.C.M.: Non-Archimedean uniformities. Kyungpook Math. J. 10 2130 (1970).

[15] Van Rooij A.C.M.: Non-Archimedean functional analysis, Marcel Dekker, 1978.